



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

III.—ETYMOLOGICAL STUDIES.

II.

Liceo, liceor.

These words are generally brought together on the supposition that the first is used as the *passive* of the second. This supposition I hope to show is mistaken.

To begin with, it is most improbable that the relations between active and passive forms should be so entirely reversed and the consciousness of those relations so entirely destroyed that the same word should exhibit the *active* relation expressed by the *passive* form and the *passive* relation expressed by the *active* form. It has not been observed in discussing these words that, where the *same* voice has been adopted to express both the active and the passive side of an action, the verbs so used either come from different roots or else are differentiated in form. Thus we have :

Active : δρᾶν or ποιεῖν ; βάλλειν ; λέγειν ; verberare.

Passive : πάσχειν ; πίπτειν ; κλύειν, ἀκούειν ; vapulare.

On the other hand, *iacēre*, *iacēre* ; *pendēre*, *pendēre*, &c., cf. Curt. Gr. Et.⁵ No. 625.

This strong *prima facie* probability against connecting these two words is strengthened by an examination of their usages.

First, if we are to assume that these two words have reversed the active and passive functions in this most extraordinary manner, we ought at least to be able to find some traces of the reversal. If we cannot discover an active use of *liceo*, the frequent use of deponent verbs in the passive at least entitles us to expect a passive employment of *liceor*. Now (1) *liceo* is said to be used in an *active* sense. But of the instances that can be cited, Mart. 6, 66, 4 rests on a sheer blunder, Diomedes 398, 25 is wholly indecisive, and the sole evidence remaining is Plin. N. H. 35, 10, 36, § 83, *percontanti quanti liceret opera effecta parvum nescio quid dixerat*, where *licerent* for *liceret* is an easy and probable correction, already proposed by Sillig.¹ Even if this doubtful sentence be admitted, it will be no evidence for writers of greater antiquity and fewer pecu-

¹ I may add that I have investigated the whole lexicology of *liceo* and *liceor* in the Journal of Philology, (English), Vol. XI, p. 332.

liarities than Pliny; and the active use of *liceo* may with justice be regarded as a later development, owing to *liceo* being thought a more rational form than *liceor* to express 'I put a price on.' (2) *Liceor* is never used in a passive sense. In the second place there is a marked difference in the meaning: *licere* is 'to be knocked down,' the result of the bidding; *liceri* is simply to bid, to offer. So long as *liceri* is going on, *licere* is impossible, so that the one cannot possibly be the active side of the other. To take two examples of *licere*. 'Omnia venibunt quique licebunt,' Plaut. Menaechm. 5, 9, 97, is 'everything will be sold to the highest bidder,' or 'for what it will fetch.' So Cic. Att. 12, 23, 5, quanti licuisse tu scribis, (if not from *licet*) means 'what they fetched.' So even in Pliny *l. c.*, quanti liceret is 'what price he would put on them,' or, in other words, 'what was the final, the selling price,' not what he would bid for them; and Mart. 6, 66, 4, parvo cum pretio diu liceret, 'when the price stuck for a long time at a trifle,' 'when all he could get for her was a small price.' *Licere* in fact is used of the final offer that concludes the sale or bargaining;¹ *liceri* of any bid, as I need not adduce passages to show.

What then are the two distinct roots from which *liceo* and *liceor* come?

Curtius *l. c.* has given that of *liceo*. He compares it with *licet*, Greek *λείπειν* and Sanskrit *ric'*. So that *licet res tanti* will mean 'an article is left, the bidding leaves off at a certain amount,'² *tanti* being a locative; see Roby, Lat. Grammar, Vol. II, § 1186, and compare the use of *stare*, *constare*.

Corssen³ supposes the root of *liceor* to be RIK, reach out. It is seen in *por-ric-ere*, etc., *pol-lic-eri*; Old High Germ. *reihhan*, Goth. *leihwan*, O. H. G. *lihan*, Germ. *leihen*, Eng. *lend*. And an examination of the original meaning of the German *bieten*, to bid, which was to hold out, as in *beut den Finger*, Keisersberg, inclines me to believe that this suggestion is probably the true one. The persistence of the middle form *liceri* in the sense 'to reach out' is very noticeable. Compare in Latin *polliceri*, *licitari*,

¹ In other words *licere* is the result of the *licitatio maxima*, Suet. Cal. 22: compare the passage quoted below from the Digest.

² The meaning and derivation of *licere* are well illustrated by Paul. Dig. 10, 3, 19, penes quem licitatio remansit. Another conjecture may be hazarded. The personal use of *licere* may be a development of the impersonal. The auctioneer may have said *licet*, 'you can have it,' when he knocked it down; then the article itself was said *licere*. So pretty nearly Curtius Gr. Et.⁵

³ I² 500.

which seems generally to mean 'to reach or lunge with a weapon' in fighting, and in Greek ὀρέγεσθαι, and for the usage *digito liceri* the Homeric χερσὶν ὀρέξασθαι.¹

From the same root RIK come besides *pol-lex* the thumb as standing out from the rest of the hand; and not improbably *pol-ling-o*, to lay or stretch out a corpse for burial, and *pol-linc-tor* an undertaker.

Trio, Septemtriones.

These words have been discussed by Prof. Max Müller.² In his discussion there are some points to which exception must be taken.

The first of these is his summary treatment of Varro's authority. Varro says 'triones enim boves appellantur a bubulcis etiamnunc, maxime quom arant,' etc. On this passage Prof. Max Müller observes: "As a matter of fact *trio* is never used in this sense except once by Varro for the purpose of an etymology"—this is a gratuitous insinuation—"nor are the seven stars ever spoken of elsewhere as the seven oxen, but only as the oxen and shaft—*boves et temo*—a much more appropriate name." It is not likely that any one will follow Max Müller in attributing fraud to Varro, and in a matter like this it is impossible that he should be *mistaken*, especially when he speaks with so much circumstantiality—a *bubulcis*—*etiamnunc*—*maxime quom arant terram*. Max Müller's reasons are of the lightest. His argument from the fact of *trio* not occurring in this sense elsewhere would put in jeopardy all ἀναξ λεγόμενα; and his appeal to 'appropriateness' is not more convincing. Different views are held by different persons about the appropriate, and 'the seven oxen' seems as appropriate a name for seven stars as, say, κύων *Canicula* is for one star. Accepting Varro's testimony means rejecting Max Müller's etymology, which indeed is improbable enough in itself. He derives *trio* from an uncertified form †*strio*† which he supposes to be an extinct Latin word for a 'star.' But not only the word but also the root, with which he connects it, STRI for STAR are devoid of authority.

We must start then with the form *trio* and the meaning 'ox' and look for some more satisfactory derivation. Max Müller,

¹ *Licitari machaera*, Caecil. ap Non. 134, 16 = ἐγχει ὀρέξασθαι, Hom. II. 4, 307, etc. Cf. *licitator* gladiator, apparitor, occisor cui multa licent (!) Gl. Isid. (Ducange).

² Science of Language, Series II, p. 804 and foll.

though preferring his †*strio*†, has suggested that it comes from the root TRI, rub, crush, another or a cognate form of TAR in *tero*, *tritius*, τρι-β-ω, etc., the oxen, I suppose, being regarded as *crushing the clods*. This derivation is phonetically unexceptionable; but it seems to be a somewhat artificial way of naming the ploughing oxen. At all events I think I can suggest a better.

Two words throw considerable light on *trio* by the phonetic changes which they evidence; they are *lien* and *via*. *Lien* is for (sp)li(gh)en, original form SPLAGHAN¹; it thus shows a weakening of *A* to *i* and a loss of GH. Precisely the same changes are shown in *via*, a word which has not had its rights from philologists.² *Via* is for *vigh-a* from root VAGH carry in *veho*, etc. It is formed straight from the root, like the Goth. *vig-s*, and not from a form *veh-ya* with suffix *ya*. For the *y* which only appears to disappear is by no means necessary to explain the *i*, and the Oscan *veia*, carriage, is no evidence for the Latin.

Trio then is for **triho* **trigho* from root TRAGH in *traho* *trag-ulum* = Eng. *drag*. It means 'the *drawer* of the plough, etc.,' the *ox*, especially when engaged in the act of drawing it (maxime quom arant terram). The suffix *-on* is frequently used of persons or things regarded as repeatedly performing an action.³ Compare *palpo*, *combibo*, *calcitro*, etc.; and *trio*, like all these, is closely connected with a *verbal* stem (*trah*).

Sudus, *sudum*, *seresco*, *serenus*, σίραιον.

The first of these words, *sudus*, is from a root SUR SVAR, shine, burn, which we see in Sansk. *svar* heaven, root *sur* shine, rule, Gr. Σείρ-ιο-ς, Lat. *ser-e-nu-s*, *Soracte*. If so, it will be for *surdus*. The loss of *r* before consonants is discussed by Corssen. In this case, as in that of *pêdo* (for *perd-o* = Gr. πέρδω) it is partly due, I think, to an endeavor to avoid confusion. It was felt that *su(r)dus*, bright, should be differentiated off from *surdus*, deaf, just as *pē(r)do*, πέρδω, from *per-do*, ἀπόλλυμι.

For the meaning 'bright, hot' see Virg. Aen. 8, 528, *arma inter nubem caeli regione serena per sudum rutilare vident*, and Non. p. 567, *sudum dicitur serenum unde et Tyberianus⁴ ait 'aureos subducit ignes sudus ora Lucifer.'* From the sense of 'burning, heating' we easily get that of 'drying.' In Latin *seresco* shows this

¹ Curt. No. 390.

²E. g. from Corssen I 460.

³Cf. Roby Lat. Gr. I, § 851.

⁴Tiberianus A. D. 336, Teuffel Rom. Lit. (Eng. Tr.), § 396.

sense most clearly; but it enters into *sudus* and *serenus* too. This is what makes *pelago sereno* (Virg. Aen. 5, 870) such an odd expression. With this 'dry sea' may be contrasted Statius' thoroughly appreciative use of the word, Ach. 1, 120, *properatque dapes largoque serenat igne domum*. The sense of 'drying' is perhaps preserved in Anglo-Sax. *sedrian*, dry, sere, Old High Germ. *sôrên*, dry up.¹

The general sense of reducing volume by heat probably appears in *σίπαιον* for *σφιπ-αιον* which is used in the same sense as the Latin *defrutum*; unless indeed the name has reference to the bright look of the liquor. In this case the Sanskrit *surā*, wine, vinous liquor, but also *water*, may be compared.

Ἀυτός.

Are we *obliged* to derive this word from a colorless pronominal root as Curtius does?² Is it not better to take it from the root AV to breathe, which we find in *ἄω* (*ἄFω*) Skt. root *vā* blow, Latin *ventus* = Eng. *wind*, etc?³ It will then mean the 'living, breathing' man *himself*.

For the superlative suffix *ta* as in *ἴπ-α-το-ς*, etc., compare the German *selb-st* by the side of *selb-er*, Eng. *self*, and the Plautine *ipsissimus*. For the transference of meaning compare the Sanskrit *ātman*, *breath*, used in the oblique cases for 'self,' and the Hebrew *nefesh*, breath. This representation of a difficult and complex abstract idea by an analogy from the concrete world may be illustrated by other examples. Eng. *self*, Germ. *selb-* has been compared with M. H. G. *sin lip* (*leib*), his *body*.⁴ Hebr. *étsem*, *self* (originally of things and then of persons), meant properly 'bone.' So *gerem* in later Hebrew. In Dinda, a language of Central Africa, *yi guop* is *yourself* (lit. your body).⁵ If the original meaning was such as we have described, the consciousness of it was lost very early, as we might expect. Compare Hom. Il. 1, 3, 4, *πολλὰς δ' ἰφθίμους ψυχὰς ἄϊδι προΐαψεν ἠρώων' αὐτοὺς δὲ ἐλώρια τεύχε κύνεσσιν*, which contrasts very curiously with Arist. Pol. V 6, 16, *αὐτοὺς τε . . . καὶ τὰ σώματα*.

¹ Taken by Curtius, No. 600 *δ*. from a root SUS. Prof. Skeat has suggested to me that *sudus* for *su(s)usus* is from the same root. The possibility of this is not to be denied, though the other words point to a root SVAR.

² Curt.⁵ 543 Eng. tr. II 161.

³ Curt. No. 587.

⁴ Grimm, Deutsch. Gramm. III, pp. 5, 647.

⁵ Pott, W. Von Humboldt und die Sprachwissenschaft, p. xx.

β ο λ β ό ς, *bulbus*, *egula* and the tests of a borrowed word.

Curtius¹ brings these two words together as examples of the disputed Indo-European B. He does not however further determine the root, an omission which I shall endeavor to supply; and he regards the Latin *bulbus* as 'not borrowed' from the Greek, 'on account of its derivatives' *bulb-ôsus-atio-ulus*, a statement which I shall endeavor to correct. The root would seem to be βορ, original GAR, eat, with λ for ρ; the second β is either to be explained as a 'mutilated reduplication,' compare γορ-γ-ό-ς quoted below and the Latin *bau-b-or*; or else -βο is the suffix, for -Fo; compare κρω-βύλος (fr. stem κρωβο κρωFo). The onion is conceived of as an *eatable* root, compare γορ-άπιες ῥάφανοι Hesych. from the same root GAR. βολβός then will have nothing to do with the Lettish *bumbuls* knob, with which Curtius compares it, and which can hardly be separated from *bumbuls* bubble placed by Curtius with *bullā* and βομβυλῖς. With regard to Curtius' second statement that *bulbus* is not borrowed from the Greek, it is to be observed, first, that it is just this class of words, names of vegetables or vegetable products, that are borrowed by Latin in greatest profusion, and secondly that the argument from the number of the derivatives is fallacious. Even if the derivatives from *bulbus* had been in early and general use, as they are late and technical,² and even if they had been ten times as many as they are, they would have proved nothing. We find *machinor*, *machinalis*, *machinatio*, *machinamentum*, *machinarius*, *machinosus*, *machinator*, *machinatrix*, *machinatus*, *machio*, *machilla*, *machinula* used frequently in all sorts of authors from the beginning of Latin literature; yet no one ever doubts that *machina* is a borrowed word.

There seems to be some confusion in the matter which it will be desirable to clear up.

Curtius has seen that if any word in a language stands isolated from the rest, this fact, when combined with others, is some presumption that it is borrowed. But he has forgotten that there is a real and an apparent isolation. A word may not have a single derivative, it may have been used in only a single instance that has come down to us, and yet it may be shown by demonstration to be of native birth; and on the other hand a word may have the

¹ Curt. No. 395 (b).

² *Bulbulus* is used by Palladius, *bulbosus* by Pliny: so is *bulbaceus*: *bulbatio* Plin. 34, 148, appears to be a *f. l.* for *bullatio*.

largest family of derivatives in the language and be as demonstrably an alien. In fact it does not matter at all how many words are *derived* from it, but whether any are *connected* with it. The fertility of a borrowed word is only a question of use and time. As soon as its strangeness has worn off and it is not distinguished by the linguistic consciousness from the rest of the language, it will resemble them in having derivatives. But however fertile it may be of offspring, it cannot 'beget ancestors' so to say. Philology will observe that only its descendants have any resemblance to it, and that they and it stand alone without other relations in the language, and will thus convict it of foreign extraction. This is true isolation, and the isolation of *bulbus*. I will illustrate apparent isolation from a single but very striking case, a word which, so far as I know, has not hitherto been derived.

Egula is a word once found in Pliny¹ as the name of a particular kind of sulphur. It is derived from root AGH to choke, which we see in Latin *ango*, Greek *ἄγω*,² etc. It is the only word from the root AGH with an *e* in which the original physical meaning is preserved, *eg-ula* being the 'choking' or 'stiffing' sulphur. In all the other cognate words *eg-enu-s* *eg-eo*, etc., which show the *e*, the meaning is the same as in the Greek *ἀχὴν*, viz. the 'res *angusta domi*,' the pinch of poverty.

Γοργός.

This word, which is explained by Hesychius as *ἐντραφής*, is to be added to the derivatives of root GAR (Curt. No. 643.) It shows a mutilated reduplication and a meaning *fat*, big, which is often derived from that of 'feeding,' e. g. *ob-esu-s* by *edo*, τρόφι (Homer) by τρέφειν. And I see no reason why γοργός, fierce, grim, and Γοργώ, should not be the same word in the active sense of 'devouring.'

ῥοίωμαι, δίω.

If we may trust Greek sound laws, this word has lost a spirant between the *o* and the *ι*. As we have no other evidence as to what it was, we must at once resort to the meaning. The following usages in Homer are significant—(1) that of *anxiously expecting*, of being painfully intent on a thing: Od. 2, 351 κείνον δ'ιομένη τὸν

¹ Pliny 35, 15, 50.

² Curtius No. 166 (a).

δύσμορον εἴ ποθεν ἔλθοι; Il. 13, 283 ἐν δέ τέ οἱ κραδίη μεγάλη στέρνοισι πατάσσει κῆρας δίομομένω; Od. 10, 248 ἐν δέ οἱ ὅσσε δακρυόφιν πίμπλαντο γόον δ' ὠίετο θυμός. Again, (2) that of *ominous presaging*, Od. 9, 213 θυμός δίστατό μοι, and even impersonally, Od. 19, 312 ἀλλά μοι ᾧδ' ἀνά θυμόν δίεταί ὡς ἔσεται περ. (3) Lastly that of *sure conviction*, of *prophetic anticipation*, whether of something within or something without our own range of power, Il. 13, 262 οὐ γὰρ δίῳ πολέμιζεν, Il. 6, 341 κινήσεσθαι σε δίῳ.

This *straining* and *watching*, this *fore-boding* and this *absolute conviction* and *confidence* of *prophecy* point us to the divining art. The word, so to speak, gives us a complete picture of the *οἰωνοσκόπος* in the various phases of his art. We see him waiting with straining eyes for the interpreters of heaven's will and trembling in a suspense of hope and fear. The message come, we hear the mysterious tones in which he announces destiny to the people, and we appreciate the confidence of prediction with which he meets and crushes all doubt and disbelief. So that it is not without reason that we find two glosses of Hesychius close together :

οἰονεῖς· οἴησεις δοκήσεις.
οἰονίζει· μαντεύει.¹

Accepting this clue, we shall take δίῳ to be for δφιῳ and to be connected with the Latin *avi-s* and the Greek δ(F)ι-ωνό-s and to have meant originally to *consult the birds* : being related to *δφίς, a bird, an obsolete Greek word, as μῆνιῳ is to μῆνις. Nor shall we wonder that a word expressing confidence or conjecture about the future should have been derived from 'bird' when we recall passages like Aristoph. Av. 720 ὄρνυ τε νομίζετε πάνθ' ὅσαπερ περὶ μαντείας διακρίνει κ. τ. λ.; or that a word proper to the diviner's art should have become part of the common stock of the language when we think of the Latin *auspicari*, *augurari*, *divinare*, *ominari*, *autumare*.

J. P. POSTGATE.

¹ The form in which M. Schmidt gives the first gloss (which, according to him, is corrupt in the MSS) is hardly satisfactory. If *δοκήσεις* is a future, as it appears to be, we should emend *οἴησει*. [*οἰονεῖς* may be for *οἰωνεῖς* and *οἰονίζει* for *οἰωνίζει*. B. L. G.]